

UNITED STATE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR				ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/974.179	11/19/97	LI			M	129249-2
QM21/0619 THOMAS R TREMPUS ALUMINUM COMPANY OF AMERICA ALCOA TECHNICAL CENTER 100 TECHNICAL DRIVE				\neg	EXAMINER	
					DEXTER,C	
					ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
					3724	
ALCOA CENTE	ALCOA CENTER PA 15069-0001				DATE MAILED:	08/19/98

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Application No. 08/974.179 Applicant(s)

Examiner

Office Action Summary

Group Art Unit 3724

Li et al.

Clark F. Dexter Responsive to communication(s) filed on ☐ This action is **FINAL**. ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213. A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 1 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). **Disposition of Claims** _____is/are pending in the application. X Claim(s) 1-45 Of the above, claim(s) ______ is/are withdrawn from consideration. ☐ Claim(s) ______ is/are allowed. Claim(s) ______ is/are rejected. is/are objected to. Claim(s) **Application Papers** ⊠ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948. ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner. ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _______ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved. ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d). ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received. received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). *Certified copies not received: Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e). Attachment(s) ☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892 ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____ ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948 ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152 --- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 3724

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restriction

- 1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-17 and 22-24, drawn to a method of trimming aluminum sheet with specific cutting angles and clearances, classified in class 83, subclass 613.
 - II. Claims 10 and 18-21, drawn to a method a trimming aluminum sheet with specific types of aluminum, classified in class 83, subclass 13.
 - III. Claims 25-36, drawn to trimming apparatus, classified in class 83, subclass 694.
 - IV. Claims 37-45, drawn to a trimmed aluminum sheet, classified in class 428, subclass 544.
- 2. Claims 10-21 have been restricted in a fashion similar to a genus-species restriction wherein the patentability of the invention is presumed to lie in the details of the particular group (e.g. the step of securing the sheet between a pad and die of Group I). It is noted that if claim 10 as originally filed is part of an elected group and determined to be patentable, rejoinder of claims 10-21 will be considered.
- 3. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Art Unit: 3724

Methods

4. Inventions of groups I and II are separate inventions. They are distinct because the

invention of group I does not require the specific details of the specific type of aluminum of group

II for patentability as evidenced by the omission thereof from group I, and the invention of group

II does not require the specific details of the various cutting angles and clearances of group I for

patentability as evidenced by the omission thereof from group II.

Method vs. Apparatus

5. Inventions I and II are related to invention III as process and apparatus for its practice.

The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be

practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can

be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case,

the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process; for

example, cutting any type of material other than aluminum.

Method vs. Product

6. Inventions I and II are related to invention IV as process of making and product made.

The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as

claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as

claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the

Art Unit: 3724

instant case, the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process; for example, by performing multiple operations including finishing operations on the product.

Apparatus vs Product

- 7. Inventions III and IV are related as apparatus and product made. The inventions in this relationship are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the apparatus as claimed is not an obvious apparatus for making the product and the apparatus can be used for making a different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different apparatus (MPEP § 806.05(g)). In this case, the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different apparatus, such as multiple cutting and finishing devices.
- 8. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Species within Group I

9. This application contains claims directed to patentably distinct species of the claimed invention; in particular, the claim limitations directed to the various combinations of cutting angles, clearances and cutting edge radii of group I.

Art Unit: 3724

Upon election of group I, applicant is then required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claim 1 is generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

10. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Art Unit: 3724

11. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(I).

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Clark Dexter whose telephone number is (703) 308-1404.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Rinaldi Rada, can be reached at (703)308-2187.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-1148. The fax number for this group is (703)305-3579.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 USC 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [rinaldi.rada@uspto.gov].

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 USC 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark Office on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Clark F. Dexter Primary Examiner Art Unit 3724

cfd

June 17, 1998